

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Jacob Baker,)	C/A: 6:12-2871-JMC-JDA
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Report and Recommendation
vs.)	
)	
Greenville Mental Health Center, SC;)	
Michael A. Baker;)	
Greenville Police Department, SC;)	
Greenville Sheriff Department, SC;)	
US Department of Justice;)	
Attorney General;)	
Cop Response Center,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.¹

Plaintiff files this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Plaintiff seeks monetary damages in the amount of twenty-one billion dollars. ECF No. 1 at 5. The Complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Pro Se and in Forma Pauperis Review

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* Complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995) (en

¹ Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

banc); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983).

Plaintiff is a *pro se* litigant, and thus his pleadings are accorded liberal construction. *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5 (1980); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. at 519; *Loe v. Armistead*, 582 F. 2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978); *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F. 2d 1147 (4th 1978). *Pro se* pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. at 5. Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* Complaint is still subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F. 2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

The Complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted,” is “frivolous or malicious,” or “seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(iii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 31 (1992). Hence, under § 1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. at 319; *Allison v. Kyle*, 66 F.3d 71 (5th Cir. 1995)

Discussion

It is impossible to determine from the Complaint and its numerous attachments what

sort of claim Plaintiff is attempting to bring before this Court. On his Civil Cover Sheet, Plaintiff checks (among other possible Nature of Suit codes) Code 440 – for miscellaneous civil rights violations. Therefore, this case is analyzed as one brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Section 1983 "is not itself a source of substantive rights,' but merely provides 'a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.'" *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271(1994) (quoting *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137, 144 n.3 (1979)). A civil action under § 1983 allows "a party who has been deprived of a federal right under the color of state law to seek relief." *City of Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes at Monterey, Ltd.*, 526 U.S. 687, 707. To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). This Complaint fails to satisfy the first element of a § 1983 claim, and is thus subject to summary dismissal.

Plaintiff does not complete the "Statement of Claim" section of his Complaint, writing only the following in the "Relief" section: "Jacob Baker want Investigation to Be always done the law to Be always Hall up. I really feel I got Done wrong for years costs me alots of money and time. If reality did afflict me mental I don't know if I ever Been the same mental that the man I was. Myself Jacob Baker 21,000,000,000." Complaint at 5 (all spelling, punctuation and grammar are Plaintiff's). Since filing the Complaint, Plaintiff has filed a number of documents as attachments, but it is impossible to tell how these may relate to a claim; these include retirement account records, arrest warrants, his childhood report cards from the 1980's, and a restaurant menu. Since Plaintiff has made no

allegation of a deprivation of civil rights, he has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss this case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. See *Denton v. Hernandez; Neitzke v. Williams; Haines v. Kerner; Todd v. Baskerville*; 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii); and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal). ***Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important warning on the next page.***

s/Jacquelyn D. Austin
U.S. Magistrate Judge

October 16, 2012
Greenville, SC

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
300 East Washington Street, Room 239
Greenville, South Carolina 29601

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).